



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,422	10/16/2002	Robert Michael Vavrek	125477	6750
23413	7590	12/12/2003	EXAMINER	
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002			ARANA, LOUIS M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2859	

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/065,422

Applicant(s)

VAVREK ET AL.

Examiner

Louis M. Arana

Art Unit

2859

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-17 and 23-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 18-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to your response filed September 24, 2003.

The response is labeled "amendment" when in fact no amendment is present. Claims 1-25 are present in this application as originally filed. Of these claims, claims 8-17 and 23-25 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims 8-17 and 23-25 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 5. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancelation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.
2. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimmlingen in view of Katznelson.

Art Unit: 2859

5. Kimmlingen discloses a multiple portion coil system for MRI. Applicant's attention is directed to the description of Fig. 1 and claim 1 of the Kimmlingen disclosure. The multiple portion coil allows for imaging in a plurality of fields of view as most simply described in the abstract of the disclosure. Note that the multiple portion coil is a Z-gradient coil. The only difference between Kimmlingen and the claims at issue is that Kimmlingen does not specifically show or explicitly describe the other two gradient coils, that is, the x-gradient and y-gradient coils.

The inclusion of such coils in a system such as Kimmlingen's, would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill in the art. It is well known that for MRI, three sets of orthogonal gradient would be needed. See for example, lines 25-45 of col. 1 of Katznelson.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed September 24, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant does not provide any reason for the alleged patentability of any of the claims except for claims 3 and 5. The alleged differences pointed out between the prior art and the limitations of claims 3 and 5 are that: 1) at least one of the first and second coil are a "single gradient coil" and 2) that the first gradient coil generates a "single field of view".

Applicant's representative appears completely unfamiliar with the MRI art, the citation made by the examiner of Katznelson makes abundantly clear that the x and y coils are "single" coils. Even if arguendo for some reason each of the coils were made of more than one coil, applicant's representative should recognize that they would be referred in

Art Unit: 2859

the art as "gradient coil". Each of the coils of the prior art except of course for the z-gradient coil produces a "single field of view" if this were not so, the very existence of these coils would be pointless. As a matter of fact, what is special or "inventive" if you will, in Kimmlingen as well as the instant application, is the generation of more than one FOV from a gradient coil or coils.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Louis M. Arana whose telephone number is (703) 305-4913. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thurs. Fridays Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego F Gutierrez can be reached on (703) 308-3875. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722.

Art Unit: 2859

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-3431.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Louis Arana". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Louis" and last name "Arana" clearly distinguishable.

Louis M. Arana
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2859

Ima
12/2/03